



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

if it would keep me out of hell, let alone purgatory? and I saw plain enough there was plenty forby me that considered that. Well, then he came to Mrs. Owens, and if he hadn't the horriest names for her that ever you heard, it's a wonder; and when he got just black in the face with abusing her, it's a fiend out of hell, I was going to call her, says he; and, sure enough, I saw many a poor creature that seemed ashamed to hear Mrs. Owens called that way, for it's she that's good to the poor. Well, then he went on to tell them what to do to the Ranters; and if they would not throw dirty water on them, and gather on them in the street, and hoot them, and sweep up the puddles in their floors in their faces with the besoms, he'd call them on the altar next Sunday, and put the curse of God and his curse on them, and never give them the rights of the church as long as they lived; and so that was Father John's sermon at the blessed altar."

"Well, and what became of it a Monday?" said Jem.

"Why, then, sure enough, I went to see," said Pat; "and what should I see, when the readers came up the street, but up comes Brady, the jammer, with a big hand-bell that Connor, the bell-man, rings in the street when there is an auction; and Brady, the jammer, comes up the street, ringing his bell, and gathering all the blackguards in the street, and sure they are the bad set in Kilcommon, and up he goes to the readers as they were going into a house; and of all the screeching, and cursing, and bad language, and ringing that ever you heard, it beat all."

"And how did the readers take it all?" said Jem.

"Just as pleasant as you please," said Pat; "they had a word to answer for everything, and were never put out, no more than if they were ringing bells themselves all their lives."

"Well, and did the people let them in?" said Jem.

"How durst they," said Pat; "when such a mob was riz on them? But I saw that a deal of them did not like it at all, and went out and listened to the readers and the clergyman quite quiet. But, oh, the jammer: when the clergyman would offer to speak a word to the people, he'd go and ring his bell up at our ear with one hand, and when that was tired with the other hand, at the other ear, screeching himself black in the face; and then the clergyman would say, holding up the Douay Bible in his hand—'Is it your own Bible that you hate, that you treat it that way? Why don't your priest come himself, and show if the book is a bad one?' And, indeed, when the people saw how pleasant and quiet the readers behaved, they thought it bad work, and out comes old Sally Smith, and says she to the jammer, 'Is that what your at, and isn't it yourself that would sell the priest next for a glass of whisky?' And, indeed, I heard after that, that the jammer was hired by Father John, and that he had a pound to put the readers out of Kilcommon, and no cure, no pay. But that's the way it is; and what will come of it, I don't know at all."

"Well, Pat," said Jem, "I'm thinking that if the priest has nothing to say agen the Bible, but dirty water and mud, and shouting, and the ringing of a bell, he'll never put it out of Kilcommon that way. Sure all the boys must see, when they come to think of it, that their religion is in a bad way, when the priest has nothing else to say for it."

"Well, indeed, I'm thinking that's true," said Pat; "but we'll see, and who knows but the readers and the Bible will have Kilcommon yet?"

POPE PIUS V.—CATECHISM OF COUNCIL OF TRENT.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE CATHOLIC LAYMAN.

SIR—I have often been surprised that the vast majority of Roman Catholics, believing themselves to possess an infallible guide, do not more generally refer to the original documents, which alone contain, with certainty, its true teaching. It rarely happens that they go beyond the instructions of their particular spiritual guide, whose fallibility they do not, in theory, deny; but whom yet they thus elevate, in practice, into their only infallible standard. It cannot be expected that all priests should be equally well informed, or should take the same views of their church's doctrines, scattered as they are over so many ponderous and difficult volumes. Hence arise the greatest differences amongst individuals, which seem completely to mar the practical utility to be derived from a common authoritative standard. An instance of this occurs to me as a good example, not that it appears to a Protestant to be on a point of any vital importance, but because it is much insisted on by eminent Roman Catholics divines, and yet seems to be a palpable inconsistency.

The 4th and 5th verses of the 20th chapter of Exodus, which form the second commandment in the Protestant version, and which, though very frequently omitted in catechisms, are yet acknowledged by the Roman Catholic Church as part of the first precept, have lately provoked no small controversy. Our translation is objected to as a wilful perversion; and it is argued that we have introduced the words "graven image" improperly, and to uphold our heretical views on that subject. To those who remember that the next word is

"similitude," or "likeness," it would seem of little moment, as this must include an image; but it is not so treated, and if worth a very warm attack, it deserves a just defence. Dr. Dixon, whose name derives unusual importance from his recent elevation to the Roman Catholic Primacy, published a work, some few months since,* in which he devotes a chapter to the meaning of the two verses, and bases much of his argument on the Protestant mistranslation, or introduction of the word *image*. Dr. Doyle, in his "Abridgement of Christian Doctrine,"† distinctly attributes great weight to this view. The Douay Bible represents the careful opinion of many of the greatest biblical students, and was specially revised by Dr. Murray, and is, therefore, to be taken as the exponent of their opinion on this point, and translates the words in question "*graven thing*."

The only translation usually referred to, as stamped by the Roman Catholic Church with the attribute of infallibility, is the Vulgate, in which the word "*sculptile*" is used, which leaves the controversy open, or rather favours the Douay version. It appears to me, however, that there is another, even (if possible) more authoritative, and certainly more decisive. The Catechism of the Council of Trent has been usually received as the undoubted expression of the church's doctrines, and, if not infallible, has never had its accuracy impeached by Roman Catholic divines. This, too, has been commonly referred to in Latin, and does not, therefore, advance the controversy a step. But, fortunately, I find that there were two editions promulgated simultaneously, both from the Papal press at Rome;‡ both with the same authoritative approval of Pope Pius V., and both in the year 1567. On an inspection of the two, there is no reason to pronounce one of more authority than the other; the one is in Latin, the other in Italian; and, if a preference should be given to either, it should be to that which was in the native language of those who drew it up, and which was, therefore, incapable of error from ambiguity or misunderstanding. Turning, therefore, to the 375th page, we find the commandment thus rendered:—

"Non ti farai alcuna *immagine scolpita*," &c., and farther on, "*non le adorerai, ne le onorerai*."

I need hardly translate words so obvious and unmis-takeable—"Thou shalt not make thee any *sculptured image*." And, again—"Thou shalt not adore them, nor shalt thou honour them." The first needs no comment, and the second expression is no less valuable; for no words are so frequently translated in different forms, and so often disputed, as those that express different kinds of forms of worship. The infallible declaration, therefore, that images are not even to receive a religious honour, seems to me to have been wholly overlooked by Roman Catholic controversialists. As to the introduction of the word "*images*," it suggests this inquiry—Are Dr. Doyle, Dr. Murray, and Dr. Dixon right, and was Pope Pius V. wrong? And, if not, then did not these three learned divines teach incorrectly, on what they said was important? This will surely show that no Roman Catholic should rest satisfied with the mere *ipse dixit* of his priest, however learned, but should refer to the documents which alone he believes infallible.

One word on a feature in this authoritative edition, particularly as it is one that may have tended to cause this very error. The oversight was most natural; for, without a very careful perusal, this text is not likely to be discovered at all. The verses that are given, as constituting the ten commandments, are printed in very large type, quite distinct from the rest of the book, and with a commendable prominence; but this fourth verse, the Protestant second commandment, is omitted in that place and type, though those before and following appear; and any reader would naturally imagine that it did not form any part of the ten commandments. However, some pages afterwards, it is introduced in the commentary, so that it cannot be said it is wholly omitted; but it is so done as not to attract notice, nor to appear a part of the commandment; and not even being placed as a quotation, between inverted commas, it might escape the notice of any reader, who was not previously aware that it was both a verse in the Bible and an integral portion of the decalogue. If this verse escaped the observation of such learned men as the three divines I have named, I may well imagine that I may happen to be the first to now place this important translation before the public.

FONTIUM PETITOR.

THE TOUCHSTONE.

(Continued from page 104.)

OBJECTION 13.—Protestants commonly teach, that people of all religions may be saved, even Pagans, Jews, or Mahometans, that believe not in Christ, nor receive his Gospel.

Their own Bible, in clear and express terms, condemns this error (St. Mark xvi. 16)—*He that believeth not (the Gospel) shall be damned. Acts iv. 12—Neither is*

there salvation in any other; for there is no other name (but the name of Jesus) under heaven given unto men, whereby we must be saved. St. John iii. 36—He that believeth not the Son shall not see life, but the wrath of God abideth on him.

REPLY.—It is plain that the persons here spoken of are such as had had the Gospel preached to them; which some of them received, and others, to their condemnation, rejected.

As for such Pagans as have lived and died without ever having heard the Gospel, no Protestant Church presumes to decide how they will be judged; because Scripture gives us no information on the subject.

But that Protestants consider it a matter of great importance to make known the Gospel to Pagan nations is sufficiently proved by the toils, and dangers, and sufferings which many of their missionaries encounter in that work; and in the zeal and liberality shown by others in sending out and supporting such missionaries.

OBJECTION 14.—Protestants teach that it is not necessary to salvation to embrace the faith and communion of the true church.

Their own Bible teaches the contrary, when it tells us (Acts iv. 47) that *God added daily to the church such as should be saved. And (Isaiah lx. 12) that the nation and kingdom that will not serve (the church) shall perish.*

REPLY.—These passages, it should be observed, make no mention whatever of the Church of Rome. Protestants do hold that the Gospel promises are limited to those who are members of the Church of Christ—namely, the universal church—which consists of all believers in Christ throughout the whole world. But they do not admit the supremacy claimed by the Church of Rome and by the Greek Church; each of which calls itself the only "true Church," and the "Catholic Church," and demands submission from all Christians. Let any one try such claims by the Touchstone of Scripture, according to the professed design of this tract. Protestants will admit the claims of the Church of Rome if any passage can be found, either in the Epistle to the Romans or in any other part of Scripture, describing the Church of Rome as supreme over all Christians, and as possessing an authority which all are bound to submit to. A doctrine so very important as this would be, if true, would surely have been mentioned by the Apostles, had they known of any such. But we find them, on the contrary, always speaking of each of the churches—of Ephesus, for instance, and Corinth, and Thessalonica, &c.—as perfectly independent of any one on earth, except the Apostles themselves.

OBJECTION 15.—Protestants look upon it uncharitable to say, that *heresy* is a damnable sin, or that *heretics* are in a state of damnation.

Their own Bible (Gal. v. 20) expressly reckons *heresies* amongst those sins of which it pronounces, *that they who do such things shall not inherit the kingdom of God.*

OBJECTION 16.—Protestants are of opinion, that no man shall be damned for following a wrong religion, if he really judges it to be right, whether he have taken sufficient pains to inform himself of the truth or no.

Their own Bible expressly tells them (Prov. xvi. 25), *There is a way that seemeth right unto a man, but the end thereof are the ways of death.*

REPLY to 15, 16.—If you read through the Prayer-book of the Church of England, including the Thirty-nine Articles, you will find no such declaration. And as for what any private individual, Roman Catholic or Protestant, may declare as his own private opinion, this, be it right or wrong, is not to be regarded as a decision of his church.*

The same observation will apply to the 16th objection. But no Protestants deny what the Apostle says at Gal. v. 19, 20, 21, concerning the sins which are there enumerated, among which, along with heresies, envyings, murders, drunkenness, and many others, they find *idolatry*—that is, adoration of images.

But Protestants do not, in general, presume to pronounce of any individual sinner that he is inevitably doomed to final perdition, and that it is impossible for the Almighty to pardon him; because God alone can perfectly know what opportunities each man has had, and what temptations he has been exposed to. And no Protestant church has ever put forth any such declaration as that contained in objection 16.

If a passage could be cited, from the works of any individual Protestant writer, declaring it as his belief that it is a matter of indifference whether a man have taken due pains to inform himself of the truth or no, this would prove nothing against any other Protestants. But we do not believe that even any one such passage could be found.

OBJECTION 17.—Protestants, to justify their wide notions of salvation in any religion, falsify the Scripture, by forging a text, nowhere to be found, even in their own Bible—viz., *that a remnant of all shall be saved.*

Their own Bible loudly condemns this forgery (Rev. xxii. 18, 19)—*I testify unto every man that heareth the words of the prophecy of this book, if any man shall add unto these things, God shall add unto him the plagues that are written in this book: and if any man shall take away from the words of the book of this prophecy, God shall take away his part out of the book of life, &c.*

* A General Introduction to the Sacred Scriptures. Duffy, 1852.
† R. Coyne, Dublin. 1846. 49.
‡ Both in Trinity College Library.

* See Eighteenth Article of Church of England.